

APPROVED: Meeting No. 38-83

ATTEST:

MAYOR AND COUNCIL
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
MEETING NO. 37-83

November 21, 1983

The Mayor and Council of Rockville, Maryland, convened in executive session, in the City Manager's Conference Room, Rockville City Hall, Maryland at Vinson Street, on Monday, November 21, 1983, at 7:00 p.m., to discuss litigation.

There being no further business to come before the Mayor and Council in executive session, the meeting was adjourned.

The Mayor and Council convened in general session in the Council Chamber, Rockville City Hall, Maryland at Vinson Street, Rockville, Maryland, on Monday, November 21, 1983, at 8:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Mayor John R. Freeland

Councilman Steve Abrams

Councilman Douglas Duncan

Councilwoman Viola Hovsepian

Councilman John Tyner, II

The Mayor in the Chair.

In attendance: City Manager Larry Blick; City Clerk Helen Heneghan; City Attorney Paul Glasgow.

Re: City Manager's Report

Mr. Blick reported the following:

1. Since the Mayor and Council began the program of mailing agendas there have been 34 requests.

2. Public Information Officer Sue Patterson has been elected Chairman of the Government Section of the Public Relations Society of America. It is a 500 member section composed of persons who work with federal, state and local governments, in public information and public affairs positions. She was also recently elected to a three year position on the Board of Directors of the 500 member National Capital Chapter of PRSA.

3. The public is invited to watch artist Judith Inglese work on the final stage of her ceramic mural on the wall of the natatorium of the Rockville Swim Center addition tomorrow from 4 to 7. Installation is expected to be completed by Thanksgiving.

Councilwoman Hovsepian commented that it is good to see the staff recognized in the manner of Mrs. Patterson.

Councilman Tyner said that the ombudsman task force has been working. A report will be coming later this evening.

Re: Correspondence

The Mayor and Council noted the following items of correspondence:

1. Letters re Project Go
2. Carol T. Cohen, re neighborhood concerns

Councilman Duncan asked if the staff has been in touch Ms. Cohen. He added that a better notification process should be used. Councilwoman Hovsepian agreed and said this is the second time this communication matter has been mentioned. Councilman Duncan agreed and said probably the police and fire department should talk to each other more often. Councilman Tyner said this particular matter has worked out but police should notify a local association when an adverse activity is taking place in the neighborhood. The City Manager said he will see that letters are written.

3. Senator Sarbanes re Metro
4. Verda Rexroth, re Maryvale development
5. Charles Short, re Convocation
6. R. & M. Hackman, re moving a fire hydrant

Re: Information Items

The Mayor and Council noted the following items of information:

1. Information on contract awards 7/83 - 9/83
2. Copy of Community Clinic Quarterly Report
3. Response to Suburban Maryland Home Builders complaint on slump tests
4. Superintendent's letter re Maryvale bus service
5. Information on Julius West Middle School
6. Copy of letter to County re North Farm
7. Letter to residents re Argyle/Monroe Development
8. Memo re Gateway Alternative School
9. Memo re Sunday Dinner Program

Councilwoman Hovsepian said she is sorry to see that the restaurant is closing. Does the staff have any news of replacement? The City Manager said not at this time.

10. First Quarter Expenditure Analysis
11. Memo re CATV External Housing

Councilman Duncan asked if there is any additional information this. Mr. Hobbs explained what this external housing will be and the fact that Tribune United is looking to a back yard location wherever it is feasible. Where it is not, the housing will be placed in the right of way. One third of the City will be wired underground. Councilman Duncan asked if it is possible to require they be placed in the back yard. Mr. Hobbs said that the legal staff is looking into this. The Mayor asked that the Mayor and Council be kept informed.

Meeting No. 37-83

-3-

November 21, 1983

Re: Citizen's Forum

The Mayor opened the meeting to those citizens who wished to address the Mayor and Council.

There being no citizen wishing to be heard, the Mayor closed the citizen's forum portion of the meeting.

Re: Decisions and
Instructions to staff re
X-87-83,
Covenant/Schiavone
Annexation

Councilwoman Hovsepien said she has a problem with this property since, regardless of the zoning, it will add traffic to Rt. 28 and until such time the road situation is improved there the development is a bad idea. She said although she would like to see it in the City she sees no solution to this problem. Councilman Duncan said he feels it should stay zoned residential. Councilman Tyner asked Mr. Cutro, Traffic Engineer, to elaborate on the traffic considerations. Mr. Cutro briefed the Council looking at the four access points and noted that residential zoning with access from Emily Court would be the best solution; however the neighborhood is opposed to it. Office zoning could not use Emily Drive for an entrance. Entering from Hurley Avenue through the Collingswood site would not be a problem for homes, but the land is owned by somebody else. In order for an entrance to be made at Watts Branch a bridge would have to be built over the 100 year flood plain. That too would be for residential zoning. As to entering Rt. 28 and Research it would be a major traffic problem whether it be residential or office. The Watts Branch plain there needs to be improved to six lanes and the bridge alone would cost about \$120,000. Even with that improvement it would still only operate at level C and it is not a good idea and should be avoided. He showed the Mayor and Council a map and elaborated on these points. Councilman Abrams asked what the impact would be if the Mayor and Council assume Rt. 28 will be relocated. Mr. Davis explained that the situation becomes more confusing with one alignment but better with another. Councilman Duncan said the application requests O-1 Zoning with access off Rt. 28. It would seem to him that the onus should be on the applicants to alter their application, since any other action by the Mayor and Council would only prolong the process. Councilwoman Hovsepien said the application was based on a specific zoning and she cannot vote for development until the road situation gets better. She said she is more than willing to annex the property but not with office zoning. Councilman Abrams asked the impact of the gas transmission line if it is developed as residential. Mr. Davis explained it is necessary for a 50 ft. setback between the gas line and development. Councilman Abrams asked if that is economically feasible

and can it be done asthetically. Mr. Davis said only through the PRU process and townhouses might be the answer. Given the topography, access and the gas line there could be a yield of thirty-six units. If they establish the isolation criteria they could increase the density. Councilman Tyner asked if it were to be annexed, zoned R-90, what would be the applicants options. Mr. Glasgow outlined the process of acceptance or rejection with a referendum. He noted, for the benefit of the Council, that there are two independent questions being considered, the one annexation and the other zoning. Councilwoman Hovsepien reiterated her concern with the traffic for any development. She stated that if the parcel were developed under the R-TH zone, suggested as a financially feasible residential alternative, the level of traffic generated would be unacceptable on Emily Drive.

Mayor Freeland said residential development is beyond the economics of the property due to the cost of access. He will not support additional traffic into that street network. He would rather deny it completely then be forced with undoing problems at a later date. It would seem to him that a decision on the circumstances as they exist today is short-sighted. He would prefer to look to the object of changing the road network and once the property is annexed the developer would assist the City with bringing pressure to bear to change the road network. He said the property can be annexed and additional conditions added to make the developer a partner of the City. Somewhere along the line, Montgomery County will rezone this property to the City's satisfaction or not. He added that this is the City's chance to control it and five years from now a wrong decision can cause much grief. He suggested the Council look to O-1 Zoning with a contract spelling out the conditions.

Councilman Duncan moved, duly seconded, to instruct the staff to prepare the necessary legal documentation to deny the application. The motion passed, Councilmembers Duncan, Hovsepien and Tyner voting aye and Mayor Freeland and Councilman Abrams voting nay.

Re: Adoption of
Ordinance: To grant,
in part, Street
Closing Application,
SCA-46-83, Shaffer,
Applicant, Bouic
Circle

Ordinance No. 40-83

On motion of Councilwoman Hovsepien, duly seconded and unanimously passed, Ordinance No. 40-83, the full text of which can be found in Ordinance Book No. 11 of the Mayor and Council, granting in part Street Closing Application, SCA-46-83, was adopted by the Mayor and Council.

Re: Introduction of Resolution: To amend the Charter of the City of Rockville so as to amend the personnel provisions of the Charter by limiting the prohibitions against various political activities to only such political activity relating to City elections, City public office, and City political issues.

On motion of Councilman Abrams, there was introduced upon the table a resolution amending the Charter of the City Rockville so as to amend the personnel provisions of the Charter by limiting the prohibitions against various political activities to only such political activity relating to City elections, City public office, and City political issues, said resolution to be the subject of a public hearing on Monday, December 12, 1983, at 8:30 p.m.

Re: Artery Bond Issue: a) Mayor & Council approval of execution of agreement between the City and the Artery Organization; b) Mayor & Council acknowledgement of Letter of Intent from New Summit Associates Limited Partnership; c) adoption of Resolution: To authorize the Issuance of tax exempt bonds in an amount not to exceed \$10,300,000.

A. Mayor and Council Approval of Execution of Agreement between the City and the Artery Organization

At its meeting of August 29, 1983, the Mayor and Council agreed to approve the request to the Artery Organization to acquire and rehabilitate the Summit Apartments utilizing tax exempt bonds.

It was originally intended that the requisite bonds would be issued by the Housing Authority of the City of Rockville. Accordingly, the Housing Authority, on September 7, 1983, adopted an inducement resolution which gave preliminary approval to the financing plan for the acquisition and rehabilitation activities.

On Tuesday, September 27, 1983, the Housing Authority conducted a public hearing to discuss the possible issuance of an estimated \$10,300,000 in bonds to finance costs to "Acquire, Construct and Equip a Multifamily Housing Project consisting of approximately 235 Dwelling Units..." In order for the project to proceed, it will be necessary for the Mayor and Council to:

- a. Approve the execution of the agreement between the City of Rockville and the Artery Organization regarding the conditions to be met by Artery in undertaking the project. That agreement is being reviewed by the City Attorney for form and content.
- b. Acknowledge acceptance of the Letter of Intent from New Summit Associates Limited Partnership.
- c. Adopt a resolution authorizing the issuance of the tax exempt bonds in an amount not to exceed \$10,300,000.

On motion of Councilman Abrams, duly seconded and unanimously passed, the Mayor and Council approved the execution of the agreement between the City of Rockville and the Artery Organization. Councilwoman Hovsepian asked if it might be possible to use some of the monies to further reduce the cost of moderate income units. Mr. Horne said this would be a future decision of the City working with the Artery organization.

B. Mayor & Council Acknowledgement of Letter of Intent from New Summit Associates Limited Partnership

On motion of Councilman Abrams, duly seconded and unanimously passed, the Mayor and Council acknowledged acceptance of Letter of Intent from New Summit Associates Limited Partnership.

Resolution No. 29-83

On motion of Councilman Abrams, duly seconded and unanimously passed, Resolution No. 29-83, the full text of which can be found in Resolution Book No. 7 of the Mayor and Council providing for the issuance and sale of \$10,300,000 bonds, was approved by the Mayor and Council.

Re: Approval of ICMA
Deferred Compensation
Plan

Resolution No. 30-83

On motion of Councilman Duncan, duly seconded and unanimously passed, Resolution No. 30-83, the full text of which can be found in Resolution Book No. 7 of the Mayor and Council adopting revisions to the ICMA Deferred Compensation Plan was approved by the Mayor and Council.

Re: Award of Contract:
Bid No. 25-84, Water
Treatment Plan
Clarifier

The subject Invitation for Bid was for the purpose of obtaining a contractor to sandblast and clean one of the Water Treatment Plan clarifiers and to repaint the clarifier.

Bids were opened on October 12, 1983, at 4:00 p.m. in the Board and Commission Room.

Only two bids were received in response to the IFB:

Klicos Painting Company, Inc.	\$58,000.00
Eastwood Painting Company	\$49,900.00
Engineer's estimate	\$15,000.00

As is evident, there is a \$34,900.00 or over 200% difference between the Engineer's estimate and the low bid. The estimate was based on prices received by

the City for the same work performed under similar circumstances five years ago and adjusted to reflect inflation.

It is not essential that the City proceed with this contract at this time. Based on the above-referenced information, it is recommended that all bids be rejected and the project be re-bid in late March or early April for completion of the work in May when the demand for this type of work is less heavy and there is less difficulty in complying with the work deadlines.

On motion of Councilman Tyner, duly seconded and unanimously passed, Bid No. 25-84, was rejected by the Council as the staff recommended.

Re: Work Session and
Instructions to staff
re Proposed Sign
Ordinance

As per the Mayor and Council's request, staff has reviewed the public hearing record on the proposed new sign regulations (T-56-83). The following is a summary of the testimony (where specific action was requested) by general topic, with comments or recommendations where appropriate.

o Government Signs

- Dr. John Law, 104 West Jefferson Street
- Jennie M. Forehand, 712 Smallwood Road

They noted that government is the most flagrant violator of sign esthetics, placement, and conformity; and that such signs are not covered in the proposed ordinance.

Comment - The sign regulations, as with all zoning ordinances, are intended to control private land use. The proposed regulations (Section 3-603 D) specifically exempt any sign erected by or at the direction of any government body having jurisdiction over the property or right-of-way on which it is located.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Political Signs

- Peter Hartogensis, 36 Orchard Way South
- Richard Arkin, 525 Lynch Street
- Rockville Chamber of Commerce
- Jennie M. Forehand, 712 Smallwood Road

1. A 15 foot sign setback for political signs in a residential zone is too restrictive. No other temporary signs have setback requirements.
2. A nine foot total sign area for political signs on a residential property is too restrictive.

Comment - Although the format has changed, the political sign regulations in the proposed code are identical to those adopted by the Mayor and Council in 1982. It should also be noted that the 15 foot setback for political signs is measured from the

street pavement, not from the property line as with other signs. The staff has no particular objection to the deletion of the 15 foot setback since Section 3-602 will still prohibit the signs from being placed in a public right-of-way.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Sign Maintenance and Abandonment

- Steve Fisher, 1014 Neal Drive
- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

1. Deteriorated or vandalized signs should be subject to a municipal infraction fine if not required or removed.
2. Signs left by former tenants should be removed.

Comment - Some damaged signs would be covered by the regulations, but only if they obstruct, endanger, impede, or confuse traffic and/or pedestrians. A sign that no longer identifies a building, business, etc., on the same lot as the sign would be in violation of the ordinance (existing as well as proposed) and must be removed. Signs that need routine maintenance (such as paint or bulbs) would be difficult to control.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Board of Appeals

- Richard Arkin, 525 Lynch Street

1. New regulations should state what kind of review authority the Board of Appeals will have over Sign Review Board action.
2. Prohibition on Board of Appeals action on sign variances must be removed from present code.

Comment - The powers and duties of the Board of Appeals are contained in Section 2-203(a) of the Zoning and Planning Ordinance. This is an administrative section that can be amended by the Mayor and Council without filing a Text Amendment Application or holding a public hearing. This section will have to be amended to lift the prohibition on sign variances, and also to provide the review authority over the Sign Review Board. If an appeal is taken to the Board, current established procedures will be followed.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Free Standing Signs Shaped like a Person, Animal, Etc., or Move or have Moving Parts

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

Is it necessary to prohibit all such signs?

Comment - This prohibition continues from the present ordinance. Such signs were prohibited by an ordinance amendment a number of years ago to improve the image of the City in general and Rockville Pike in particular.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Sign Logo or Emblem

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

Sees no purpose in 20 percent area limitation for logo or emblem on sign.

Comment - This limitation would apply only to a freestanding sign. This limitation is intended to prevent a logo from consuming an entire sign. There is no attempt to limit what one chooses to use as a "logo."

The Mayor and Council discussed the logo concept at length. It was their feeling that there should be a waiver for registered trade marks or for any abstract that is registered. The Mayor and Council agreed that the waiver would be allowed for the registered trade marks if a Sign Review Board agrees.

o Portable Signs

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

Rather than prohibiting portable signs, perhaps they could be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Comment - Portable signs are one of the most numerous violations of the current code. The volume of such signs would make any other form of regulation difficult. The proliferation of these signs would have an adverse impact on the image of the City

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Changeable Letter Signs

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

Questions the prohibition of changeable letter signs.

Comment The proposed regulations prohibit changeable letter signs, except as specifically provided for. The exceptions are: gasoline price signs; "time/temperature" signs; a theatre or entertainment establishment sign; and a major enclosed mall sign. Any other signs would need a new permit before a change of text or graphics. This type of sign is designed to be eye-catching; therefore, they can be a distraction and a safety issue.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Enforcement

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

1. The City should have a right to dispose of signs at the owner's expense after it is removed and not claimed.
2. There does not appear to be any penalty provision for enforcement of the new regulations.

Comment - The City will remove only those signs found illegally on public property or right-of-way. Such signs will be retained for three working days, then disposed of. All illegal signs on private property must be removed by the owner.

The sign regulations will be a part of the Zoning and Planning Ordinance and, therefore, subject to penalties (municipal infraction and other civic action) already contained therein. The penalties are adequate if effectively applied.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Permanent Identification Signs for Subdivisions

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

The regulations should contain the criteria which the Traffic Engineer must follow in approving such signs.

Comment - Section 3-605 A2(b) provides that Final location of such sign shall be approved by the Traffic Engineer. The only area of review, therefore, given to the Traffic Engineer is that of location.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Miscellaneous Temporary Signs

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

The proposed regulations do not address the proliferation of certain temporary signs such as garage sales, lost and found, etc. These should be allowed but removed within 24 hours of the function.

Comment - The regulations do not allow for these types of signs. However, most are only posted for a very brief period (a few hours or over a weekend). Temporary miscellaneous signs can be among the most numerous violators. Any attempt to make provisions for some of them could result in a more difficult administrative/enforcement problem.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Sign Review Board

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce
- Herman Hartman, 125 South Van Buren Street
- Richard Arkin, 525 Lynch Street

1. Several comments regarding whether three or five members would be more desirable.
2. Is there any problem with the alternate, when voting, not being one of the required representative groups?
3. A representative from a church or synagogue should be required on the Sign Review Board.
4. The regulations should clearly state that the Sign Review Board must approve signs in accordance with the sign ordinance.

Comment - The Sign Review Board is proposed to have three regular members and an alternate member. The three regular members must consist of one licensed architect, one businessperson operating a business in Rockville, and one resident who has no vested interest in any business in Rockville or in the sign industry. There are no stated qualifications for the alternate; therefore, the Mayor may appoint without limitation. A quorum of any two members may conduct all business without regard to group representation.

The regulations give the Sign Review Board considerable latitude in granting modifications to the regulations; however, one of the guidelines states that modification be "without substantial impairment of the intent, purpose, and integrity of the regulations." The Sign Review Board is also not allowed to grant a modification which would allow any sign specifically prohibited by the regulations.

There was considerable discussion by the Planning Commission and Sign Ordinance Advisory Committee regarding how many members should be on the Sign Review Board. With the addition of the alternate member before finalizing the proposed regulations, the Planning Commission concluded that the Sign Review Board should function as effectively as the Board of Appeals. The Board of Appeals has never failed to have a quorum with this membership arrangement.

The Council agreed the Sign Review Board would have three members and one alternate.

o Aggregate Sign Area Concerns

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

1. It is not clear when a freestanding identification sign will be counted in the aggregate sign area of an individual business or tenant.
2. It is not clear whether a freestanding identification sign in the C-1 Zone will be counted in any individual's sign area.
3. Will a changeable message sign, if freestanding, be counted against an individual's sign area?

Comment - We believe the regulations are clear regarding sign areas for free-standing identification signs. Only one entity may be named on a free-standing identification sign. If the sign identifies a business/tenant, that entity is charged for the sign area. If the sign contains only the name of a center or building without identifying a particular business/tenant, the sign area is not counted in the aggregate sign area of any tenant. It should be noted that there are other types of freestanding signs (other than the identification signs) which are not counted against the aggregate sign area of either the building or the individual tenant.

A freestanding identification sign in the C-1 Zone shall contain only the name of the shopping center or the name of the neighborhood in which it is located. No individual tenant may be named. Therefore, there is no need for an aggregate sign area requirement.

Changeable message signs are subject to separate regulation. Whether freestanding or building mounted, it will be counted in the sign area allowance of whoever erects the sign.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Building Mounted Signs

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

1. What does "pedestrian level" mean?
2. The meaning of the term "frontage" is not clear.

Comment - In the Town Center zones and in the U-1 Zone, signs for individual businesses/tenants in a multi-tenant building shall be placed only on "pedestrian levels." This is intended to place the signage where the pedestrian activity is located. The pedestrian areas may be at ground level or elevated at various levels, and may be public or private areas. A graphic in the regulations is intended to clarify this.

"Frontage" for sign calculation purposes means any exterior elevation of a building, or part thereof, occupied by a business/tenant. Graphics are used to indicate this; however, since only two elevations can be shown in the graphic, a note may also be needed.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Window Signs

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

The 20 percent window coverage is unreasonable and should be increased to 60 or 75 percent.

Comment - Window signs, being temporary, are among the most difficult to control. Such signs which do not exceed 20 percent of the area of a window unit are exempt from regulation. A merchant may have larger signs, but these would be subject to normal sign allowance and permit requirements.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Historic District Signs

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

Are signs in the historic districts controlled by the Historic District Commission or the Sign Review Board?

Comment - Signs in the historic district are subject to all the regulations of the sign code, plus they must meet with the final approval of the Historic District Commission. One board would not override the other. An applicant must satisfy both.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Ordinance Review

- Rockville Chamber of Commerce

The new regulations should be reviewed after two years by staff and a citizens committee.

Comment - It is possible that deficiencies or difficulties will be found after some experience with the new regulations. This can be anticipated with such a comprehensive amendment and should not distract from the major work effort that has gone into this project. We will be prepared to take prompt corrective action as soon as any major problem is identified.

The Mayor and Council made no change.

o Liberalizing Sign Ordinance

- Kenneth Diffenderfer, 8304 MacArthur Boulevard

Would like to improve the business environment of Rockville by liberalizing any sign ordinance.

Comment - With only a few exceptions, the proposed regulations are more flexible and allow more signs than the current regulations.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Church and Synagogue Signs

- Gerald Williams, First Baptist Church

Signs for churches and synagogues should be larger than the 24 square feet allowed.

Comment - The proposed regulations will increase the area of such signs from 16 square feet to 24 square feet (one for each street frontage). This is considered a standard size by the sign industry. If a larger sign is needed at a particular site, due to unusual circumstances, the Sign Review Board would be able to consider granting a modification.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Residence Identification and Home Occupation

- Richard Arkin, 525 Lynch Street

Requiring only one sign to include all street numbers, family identification, and home occupation information is too restrictive.

Comment - The present ordinance allows one, 50 square inch sign for street number and residence identification, and one, 100 square inch sign for home occupation. The proposed regulations would allow one sign of 150 square inches to be used for all residential sign purposes.

To give some flexibility, the staff suggests that this requirement be modified to allow a sign or signs with a total area of 150 square inches.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

o Residential Special Exceptions

- Staff

Comment - The proposed regulations provide that the Board of Appeals shall approve all signs for special exception uses in residential zones as part of the special exception approval process. Since there will be no standards contained in the ordinance, existing special exception uses may have some difficulty if a new or additional sign is desired. This regulation could also make all signs for existing residential special exceptions nonconforming and subject to removal (this was not intended).

The staff suggests that a "grandfather" provision be added to Section 3-606 B so that residential special exceptions, valid on the date of adoption of the new regulations, may have the following options:

- a. Maintain existing signs or erect new signs that comply with the previous ordinance; or
- b. Apply to the Board of Appeals, using standard special exception amendment procedures, for any sign as may be approved by the Board.

The Mayor and Council accepted the staff recommendation.

The ordinance will be introduced at the Mayor and Council meeting on December 12 along with the resolution on fees. The ordinance will take affect on July 1, 1984.

Re: New Business

1. Councilman Duncan noted that the Wootton Volleyball team, the Rockville Soccer Team and the Richard Montgomery Field Hockey team are in the State finals. He asked that these teams be brought in for recognition by the Mayor and Council. Councilwoman Hovsepian suggested that the National Merit Semi-Finalists also be honored in this manner. Mayor Freeland said this would be an excellent idea to honor these young people and it would possibly increase competition among schools. He asked that the Commission on Public Education be involved in inviting these students to avoid oversights. The Council agreed such an event should take place whenever an occasion arises to warrant it.

2. The City Manager said \$28,000 was budgeted from the SWM account for pond dredging at the golf course. A good deal of run off has been received into the ponds from the Red Gate Industrial Tract. It will be necessary to dredge two dry ponds and two wet ponds at a total cost of \$70,000. The Mayor and Council agreed that the money could be reappropriated from the SWM contribution fund.

Re: Executive Session

On motion of Councilman Abrams, duly seconded and unanimously passed, the meeting was closed for executive session to discuss personnel and litigation.

Re: Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Council in executive session, the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m. to convene again in general session on Monday, December 12, 1983, at 8:00 p.m. or at the call of the Mayor.